

**REMARKS**

Prior to this Amendment, Claims 1-30 were pending in the application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-6, 8, 19-24, 26-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,043 to Lester et al. (hereinafter Lester) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,085 to Jung, which is a Samsung reference. The Examiner rejected Claims 9-10 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,980,213 to Hirose et al. (hereinafter Hirose). The Examiner rejected Claims 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung in view of Hirose and further in view of Lester. The Examiner rejected Claims 7, 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lester in view of Jung and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,321,861 to Oon.

As indicated above, Claim 9 has been amended. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1-30 are now pending, with Claims 1, 8, 9, 19, and 30 as independent Claims.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent Claims 1 and 8, the Examiner states that Lester discloses a voice processing method in a mobile terminal (Lester, Figs. 1-4) and further discloses the limitations of prioritizing services (Lester, Fig. 2), comparing priority levels of first and second services, and selecting one of the first and second services (Lester, column 5, lines 48-53). (Office Action, pages 2-3). However, the system disclosed by Lester includes a switching system 18, which comprises a base station, and communication devices 16, which comprise handsets. (Lester, FIG. 1, column 3, lines 10-24). The processing method disclosed in Lester is not in a mobile terminal, but rather in a base station. The switching system 18, which comprises a base station, compares priority ratings of communication links, terminates a lower priority communication, and opens a communication channel for a requested link. By performing

processing in the switching system/base station 18, rather than the communication devices 16, Lester teaches away from the limitations of Claims 1 and 8. Further, Jung does not cure the deficiencies of Lester. All of the claimed features of independent Claims 1 and 8 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Lester and Jung or by either reference alone. Therefore, Claims 1 and 8 of the present invention are patentable over Lester in view of Jung. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claim 19, which recites, in part, “a mobile terminal capable of switching different voice outputs to different output devices,” Claim 19 is not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Lester and Jung, for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent Claims 1 and 8. All of the claimed features of independent Claims 19 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Lester and Jung or by either reference alone. Therefore, Claim 19 of the present invention is patentable over Lester in view of Jung. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claim 30, which recites, in part, “a computer readable recording medium in a mobile terminal having a processor and capable of switching different voice outputs to different output devices,” Claim 30 is not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Lester and Jung, for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent Claims 1 and 8. All of the claimed features of independent Claim 30 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Lester and Jung or by either reference alone. Therefore, Claim 30 of the present invention is patentable over Lester in view of Jung. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 30 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 9, which has been amended to recite, “wherein the voice switch has first and second input terminals for receiving the decoded voice”


signals from the voice CODEC,” Claim 9 is patentable over Jung in view of Hirose. The Specification of the present invention discloses that the voice switch 52 has two input terminals for receiving voice signals from the voice codec 51 and two output terminals. (Specification, page 10, line 20-page 11, line 3; FIG. 5). By contrast, Jung discloses a switching portion 30 that receives audio from an audio processor 10 and an external input terminal 90. (Jung, column 2, lines 48-54; FIG. 2). In other words, the present invention discloses a switch having two input terminals for receiving two audio signals from one device (CODEC), while Jung discloses a switch receiving audio input from two different devices (audio processor 10 and external input terminal 90). Further, Hirose does not cure the deficiencies of Jung. Therefore, Claim 9 of the present invention is patentable over Jung in view of Hirose. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 10-18, and 20-29 are dependent claims, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above with regard to their respective independent Claims 1, 9, and 19.

**Attorney Docket No: 678-1149 (P10760-US)**

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-30 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475